



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,051	04/03/2001	Kristopher P. Braud	017017620004	2009
27964	7590	02/04/2005	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES P.C. P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			TO, BAOQUOC N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/825,051	BRAUD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Baoquoc N To	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2 and 21-22 are amended on 10/04/2004 and claims 51-52 are not addressed in the last Office Action. Claims 51-52 are inadvertently left out the in the Office Action dated on 06/30/2004. These claims are addresses in this Office Action.

Claims 1-52 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues "Swanson does not teach or suggest determining if data stored in the ancillary system is conducive to being processed into a value of a data item."

The examiner disagrees with the above argument. Swanson discloses "client stubs 60 are responsible for locating a server to handle the request, packaging input arguments and passing them over the network 10 to the server with the validating ticket, waiting for the server to reply and unpacking the return value and output arguments returned by the server" (col. 7, lines 2-14). In order for the system to return the value back to the client, the data stored in the system must be determined to be process into a value. Then after that, the server returns the value for the client request. In order to further distinguish over the cited reference the examiner suggests the applicant to discloses the recited determine process in the more details.

The applicant also argues “Swanson does not teach or suggest that data for the value of a data item is stored in an ancillary system and a data processing system as recited in independent claims 1 and 21. Once again assuming that the server and the subsystems are the data processing system and the ancillary system of the claimed invention, Swanson simply teaches that a request for service from a server is made and the appropriate server provides the information for the request. (see column 5, lines 61-62 and column 6, lines 21-31.) The examiner appears to assert that the request and the information correspond to the data stored in two different systems, the ancillary system and the data system, as recited in claims 1 and 21. The request, however, is not data for a value of a data item as recited in amended claim 1 and 21 but a request for information for the value. Additionally, the applicants do not find any other teaching or suggestion in Swanson of data for a value for in two different systems. Accordingly, Swanson does not teach or suggest that data for the value of a data item is stored in an ancillary system and the data processing system as recited in amended claims 1 and 42.”

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above arguments. First of all, Swanson discloses “fig. 3 is only an example and that many other types of requests are made within the healthcare transaction network 10. For example, request 64 for member enrollment information may be made by program 54 in the benefit subsystem 30. The benefit subsystem 30 holds information regarding benefit plans. The benefit plans define what services are covered and at what level each service is covered. Following this example and referring to fig. 3, the benefit subsystem 30 is the client and

the enrollment subsystem 26 is the server. Broadly, enrollment subsystem 26 processes benefit subsystem's 30 client's request for member enrollment information and returns the information to benefit subsystem 30 appended to the server stubs 62" (col. 6, lines 19-31). In the multi-subsystem configuration as to Swanson the subsystem depends on the other system to service the user request. As illustrated in the example above, the member enrollment is the ancillary system and the benefit system is the data processing system to service the client request wherein both system stored information about the user plan enrollment and the benefits are described as user enrolled.

Secondly, the request, however, is not data for a value of a data item as recited in amended claims 1 and 21 a request for information for the value is not different because data and information is the same unless the data in the recited claim has different meaning. In that case, the examiner suggests the applicant(s) explicitly define in order to distinguish over the cited reference.

Finally, as the illustrated in Swanson col. 6, lines 19-13. The enrollment subsystem stores information about the user and the healthcare plan and the benefit subsystem stores the layout of the benefits, which associated with the healthcare plan that the user chooses. In order to service the client request, the enrollment system is called and the benefit system is called for the benefit. Both sub-system store information about user and their benefits.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson et al. (US. Patent No. 6,112,183).

With respect to claims 1 and 21 Swanson teaches a data processing system implemented method for managing data of an enterprise network that includes a plurality of ancillary system and an enterprise data processing system, comprising:

receiving a request for a value of a data item (the client request) (col. 5, lines 5-10);

identifying an ancillary system of the plurality of ancillary system associated with the requested data item (the client stub 60 locates the appropriate server to handle the request) (col. 6, lines 38-46), wherein data for the value is stored in the ancillary system (request for col. 6, lines 20-25) and the data processing system (the server ready to process requests the client request) (col. 5, lines 61-62) ;

processing the data into the value for the data item and returning the requested value for the data item (the client stub 60 unpacks the output argument and returns them to the client application) (col. 6, lines 63-65).

Swanson does not explicitly teach determining whether the data stored in the

ancillary system is conducive to being processed into the value; retrieving the data from one of the ancillary systems and the data processing system based on whether data stored in the ancillary system is conducive to being processed into the value. However, Swanson teaches, "the request 64 for member enrollment information bay be made by program 54 in the benefit subsystem 30. The benefit subsystem 30 holds information regarding the benefit plans" (col. 6, lines 21-25). In addition, Swanson teaches, "server stubs 62 are responsible for listening for client requests, unpacking the input arguments, validating server access, calling server function, packaging the return value and output arguments returned by the server code, recording audit information, gathering performance data and passing return value and output arguments back to client stub 60 over network 10" (col. 7, lines 8-14). This teaches the server returned a value corresponding to the input parameters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to process the request and return to a value as taught in Swanson to allow the processing the data in the stored data in the system.

As to claims 2, 22, and 42, Swanson further discloses identifying all data updated in the ancillary system since a last block transfer of data to the data processing system; requesting a block transfer of updated data from the ancillary system; and copying the block of updated data to the data processing system (col. 5, lines 1-5).

As to claims 3, 23, and 43, Swanson further discloses wherein processing the retrieved data into the value for the data item is performed subsequent to copying and prior to receiving the request (col. 7, lines 8-14).

As to claims 4, 24, and 44, Swanson further discloses wherein processing the retrieved data into the value further comprises aggregating the data into a value for the data item (col. 6, lines 5-10).

As to claims 5, 25, and 45, Swanson further discloses wherein the data stored in the ancillary system is more current than the data stored in the data processing system (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 6, 26, and 46, Swanson further discloses rules for identifying an ancillary system that is associated with a data item (col. 5, lines 44-46); and rules for determining whether data stored in the ancillary system is conducive to being processed into the value (col. 5, lines 44-46).

As to claims 7, 27, and 47, Swanson further discloses attempting to contact the ancillary system (col. 5, lines 1-5); querying the ancillary system for the data (col. 5, lines 60-65); and receiving the data from the ancillary system (value) (col. 7, lines 5-14).

As to claims 8 and 28, Swanson further discloses attempting to contact the ancillary system based on the data stored in the ancillary system being conducive to being processed into the value (col. 5, lines 5-10); and receiving the data from the ancillary system based on the ancillary system being unresponsive, (col. 5, lines 5-10).

As to claims 9, 11, 29, and 31 recite similar limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 21; therefore, claims 9 and 29 are also rejected for the same reasons as given in claims 1 and 21.

As to claims 10 and 30, Swanson further discloses catching a message, wherein the message was generated by an ancillary system using a set of content rules and the

message conforms to a message standard; opening the message; identifying the ancillary system based on the message, (col. 58, lines 38-42); accessing content conversion rules based on the identity of the ancillary system, (col. 48, lines 19-24); converting content from the message to enterprise information using the content conversion rules, (col. 48, lines 19-24); and storing the enterprise information in the data processing system, (col. 58, lines 27-28).

As to claims 12, 32, and 50, Swanson further discloses wherein the data item is a line item in a document (col. 7, lines 40-50).

As to claims 13 and 33, Swanson further discloses wherein the data item relates to financial information, and the financial information is in a document (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 14 and 34, Swanson further discloses calling a security model for requestor security information (col. 6, lines 54-55); receiving the requestor security information from the security model (col. 6, lines 54-55); and accessing a security key related to the requested data item based on the requestor security information (col. 6, lines 54-55).

As to claims 15 and 35, Swanson further discloses determining whether the data item relates to employee information or financial information; accessing management organizational information; and determining whether to return the requested data item value based on the requestor having access to the employee information (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 16 and 36, Swanson further discloses prior to calling a security model for requestor security information, determining whether the data item relates to

employee information or financial information (col. 7, lines 31-37); and determining whether to return the requested data item value based on the security key (col. 7, lines 31-37).

As to claims 17 and 37, Swanson further discloses monitoring a clock for a predetermined time interval (col. 8, lines 1-5).

As to claims 18 and 38, Swanson further discloses receiving a second request for the value of a second data item (col. 6, lines 50-55); identifying an auxiliary datastore associated with the second data item (col. 6, lines 50-55); and retrieving the value for the data item from the auxiliary datastore (col. 7, lines 5-15).

As to claims 19 and 39, Swanson further discloses identifying an ancillary system related to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-5); identifying all data updated in the ancillary system since a last block transfer of data to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-10); requesting a block transfer of updated data from the ancillary system (col. 5, lines 1-10); and copying the block: of updated data to the auxiliary datastore (col. 5, lines 1-10).

As to claims 20 and 40, recite similar limitations as discussed in claims 2, 22, and 42; therefore, claims 20 and 40 are also rejected for the same reasons as given in claims 2, 22, and 42.

With respect to claim 41 recites similar limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 2, Swanson also teaches ancillary system access rules (col. 7, lines 32-37).

As to claim 48, Swanson further discloses wherein the enterprise is a healthcare provider (col. 7, lines 39-53).

As to claim 49, Swanson further discloses an automated interface for catching message and redirecting the messages to the ancillary system data transfer mechanism (col. 5, lines 1-5).

As to claims 51 and 52, Swanson teaches the method recited in claim 10, wherin the caught message was generated spontaneously by the message-generating ancillary system (col. 58, lines 38-42).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Baoquoc N. To
Feb 2rd, 2005



JEAN M. CORNELIUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER